Hal Verb
PO Box 421815
San Francisco, CA 94142-1815

1/23/95

Dear Hal,

I appreciate the trouble and expense you went to and the contents with your 1/21, here yesterday afternoon but there are none in the Washington area I know who do not already know about the 1/25 hearing. There in another aspect of hearings like that one to which I draw your attention. Those hearings are to let the board know what records exist that have not been disclosed. When as has happened at several of those hearings of which I know the nuts who know nothing at all about actual records and care even less about them run off at the mouth with their nuttiness it turns the board off and give fuel to those who may not be all that anxious for there to be full disclosure. I am confident that the staff wants full disclosure and I presume this may be true of some members of the board but the more nonsense and worse they are given the more that interferes with disclosure and the willingness to go to the trouble some of them means. I have given them specifics of actual records withheld and copies of records that so indicate. When the Judges and Livingsyones put on the performance they did at COPA and the Harrs did at Dallas that does not help and it does hurt. The kind of crap from these and from others hurts. It does not help. And there is nothing the board can get from those who are ignorant of the actual records, have never had any interest in them, Then consider also the consequences of persuading the board of what it not true and having it make serious efforts to get - what does not exist. So, I think we do not want to regard the board as what it is not and that we do not want the nuts to appear, waste their time, and make it appear that those who say there are withheld records are not to be credited.

I agree with Mantik on the Dale Meyers stuff. I see no real usefulness in the Meyers approach.

I think Brandt is worth no time at all.

I do not know the answer on Mrs. Beck. I suppose it is possible.

I think time spent on Carr is wasted.

I agree with you on Pauline Bates.

I do not know the answer re those splotches perhaps from fingerprint powder but again, I do not see that this can now lead to anything of value. Do you know anything about Waldron? Martin Waldron who was a NY Times reporter was a friend.

On your double head-shot article, which I think is good, I also agree with you that it as wrong to go off the records as they did, with anything at all.

Wallace and Cyril did a good job on Lattimer who seems dedicated to destroying any credibility he ever had. Which I think was little to begin with.

I am concerned about the wasting to time for the baord and its staff. There is simply an enormous volume of records in many government agency files and they'll not be able to get anything like all of them disclosed in any event. So any time wasted for them is hurtful. In addition, the more they check and find foolish the less they will feel determined to persevere. Then there are seeming solid cases that can be made, like that the back of JFK's head was blown out. Whether or not this indicates or can indicate any records being withheld, before a case is given to such a body there should be some checking of existing fact. Not just an argument to make the case for the theory. In this instance, what does the Zapruder film show? That the back of the head was not blown out. So, unless it can be shown that the film was doctored, and I believe that is impossible, giving anything like this to the baord is counterproductive, hurtful and turns it off and diminishes all else they are given.

Gary Aguilar appears to be put out over my disagreement with something that is probably a theory. He did not response when I asked him for the source of Finck saying that there were pictures taken at the autopy he did not see when shown supposedly all those picture and he did not response when I made a suggestion to him about how he could carry forward with JAMA what he started and others did when they first protested the Humes defense. I have no personal feeling about this. I rather like Gary. But not telling me the source of that Finck statement was hurtful. Not in the least to me personally. I'll regret it very much if he and those he deals with find themselves in the end like those blind wise men of Hindustan who in the poem were taken to an elephant and each described what he felt, like a might tree, a snake, etc. I think that those who believe the autopsy film was toyed with should begin by being their own devil's advocates, as I suggested to both Gary and Mantik. The basic question for them to address is why would anyone run the risk of toying with the film only to wind up with what destroys the purpose of any such tricks, with film that destroys the official story? For one thing, and there are more than this one, with those 40 dust-like fragments in a head X-ray. That is absolutely impossible with miliary ammo. Or showing fragments where the autopsists siad there were none. To illustrate what withholding that info from me can mean, I knew a board staff member before he was on the staff. I could give it to him and then he'd have a basis for seeking the missing film. And I have taken time for Gary whenever he phoned and wrote. One big blowback on any such projects and they'll see what I mean. And with that back of the head blown out thing, the X film shows the head there intact at about frame 336, for several frames. And if it were possible to alter so tiny an original, hardly more than 1/4 in maximum dimension, so that on projection to a width of five feet, what I had when I saw those slides in early 1967 or late 1966, and not have it show, which I do not for a minute believe, what then about having access to all the copies so they, too, could be altered. And what if one was not gotten and altered?

Again thanks, and best wishes,

Hal